

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

**Section 102 Rejections**

**Claims 1, 9, 17, 28, 39, 61, 71, 81, 91 and 101**

One common element in these claims is either a switching, switch or method of operating a switch, with the switch having fabric or F\_ports, a node or N\_port and a switch interconnecting the ports. That portion of each claim has been rejected over Stai, basically Figure 1. Stai discloses a fabric 102 having a series of fabric ports F\_ports 104A and 104B and an FL\_port 105. Stai also discloses a series of nodes 106A, 106B and the devices presenting NL\_ports 110A-110E.

The preambles of claims 1, 9 and 101 clearly require the nodes and first fabric to be separate from the claimed switch or switching devices. The Office Action has apparently ignored this distinction. The only illustrated fabric or F\_ports are provided by the only fabric shown in Figure 1. The only illustrated node or N\_ports are those provided by the nodes themselves, not a different device. Thus, when the required separate elements, the first fabric and the nodes, are removed from Fig. 1 of Stai, nothing remains. This results in a clearly improper rejection. Alternatively, the Office Action may be treating each of the items in Fig. 1 of Stai as both a preamble item and as an element in the body of the claim. Again this develops into a clearly improper rejection. Applicants therefore submit that the rejections of claims 1, 9 and 101 are improper.

Claims 17, 28, 39 and 50 all require as their first two elements a series of nodes and a first fabric. As above, these limitations are met by the nodes 106A, 106B and the devices of the NL\_ports 110A-110E and by the fabric 102. Again this leaves no remaining elements in Fig. 1 to be corresponded to the remaining claim elements, unless the Office Action is improperly corresponding the various items to two separate claim elements. This is a further indication of the improper nature of the rejection.

Claims 61, 71, 81 and 91 all require as the first two elements a series of nodes and first and second fabrics. As to the rejection of these claims, not only are the problems discussed above present, Fig. 1 only shows one fabric, not the first and second fabrics alleged in the Office Action. The rejections of claims 61, 71, 81 and 91 are thus improper for numerous reasons.

**Claims 2, 10, 18, 29, 40, 51, 62, 72, 82, 92 and 102**

Claims 2, 10, 18, 29, 40, 51, 62, 72, 82, 92 and 102 all require the node or N\_port to operate as a virtual node or N\_port, with one virtual node or N\_port address per fabric or F\_port. The Office Action has merely cited to portions of Stai which define N\_ports and F\_ports. There is no teaching of a virtual node or N\_port and no teaching of providing one virtual node or N\_port address per fabric or F\_port. The rejection is highly improper and must be withdrawn.

**Claims 5-8, 13-16, 21-24, 32-35, 43-46, 54-57, 65-67, 75-77, 85-87, 95-97 and 103-106**

Applicants submit that the rejections of these claims are improper. Referring to the arguments above for the independent claims, in all cases there are either no remaining elements of Stai, Fig. 1 to use to make these rejections or additional items have been used multiple times by corresponding them to different claim elements. In either event the rejections are improper and should be withdrawn.

**Claims 107-117**

Applicants submit these rejections are improper. As to claims 107-112 and 117, the cited fabric has previously been cited as the first fabric, so it cannot be reused as the required fabric of those claims. As to claims 113-116, the cited fabric has already been corresponded to the claimed first and second fabrics. Using it to also correspond to a separate third fabric is wholly improper. Withdrawal of the rejections is requested.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the above remarks Applicants respectfully submit that all of the present claims are allowable. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

**April 3, 2008**

**/Keith Lutsch/**

Keith Lutsch, Reg. No. 31,851

Filed Electronically

Wong, Cabello, Lutsch,  
Rutherford & Brucculeri, L.L.P.  
20333 SH 249, Suite 600  
Houston, TX 77070  
832-446-2405